



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,345	07/22/2003	Gregory J. Petras	WC01520-2	9776
28548 7590 08/27/2007 STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD 3113 NORTH 3RD STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85012			EXAMINER LIN, SHEW FEN	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,345

Applicant(s)

PETRAS ET AL.

Examiner

Shew-Fen Lin

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- a. This action is taken to response to amendments and remarks filed on 5/29/2007.
- b. Claims 35-36 and 43-85 are pending. Claims 35, 43, and 64 are independent claims.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application 09/782873, filed on 2/10/2001 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Since the provisional application relied on part of the priority document (Continuation-in-Part), the claim of priority will be considered on a claim-by-claim basis.

Claim Objections

The phrases "such..." are recited in numerous places in the claims which makes the scope of the claims indeterminate either indefinite or lack of antecedent. It is suggested that "the..." or "said..." should be used.

Applicant is advised that should claim 48 be found allowable, claim 49 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim 50 recites the limitation "to completing". It should be "for completing" or "to complete".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 45, 47-49, 52, 54-56, 58, 60-61, 63, 66, 68, 70, 72-74, 76, 78-79, 81, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "***substantially***" recited in claims 45 and 66 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention.

Claim 47 recites the limitations "***such population of users***", "***such management community***". There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claim.

Claims 48-49 and 68 recite the limitations "***such knowledge of users***", "***such group of users***". There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claims. It is unclear that it refers to "at least one group of users" as recited in claim 43 or "from the group consisting" recited in claim 44.

As per claims 52 and 70, the word "***if any***" renders the claims indefinite. It is unclear what happens when the "if" statement is not true, making the scope of the claim unascertainable.

Art Unit: 2166

Claims 54 and 72 recite the limitation “ *such at least one user*”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claims.

Claims 54 recites the limitation “e)... *such accumulated points*”, “f)...with *accumulated points*”. It is not clear if it is a new instance of “accumulated points” or a reference to the original accumulated points thus lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 55 and 73 recite the limitations “ *such computer software*”, “ *such at least one user* ”. There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claims.

Claims 56 and 74 recite the limitations “ *such at least one item*”, “ *such involved subset of such population of users* ”. There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claims.

Claims 58 and 76 recite the limitations “ *such set of performance goals* ”, “ *such population of users* ”, and “*such reward system* ”. There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claims.

Claims 60 and 78 recite the limitations “ *such at least one user* ”, “ *such at least one pre-determined category* “. There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claims.

Claims 61 and 79 recite the limitation “ *such pre-determined information* “. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claims.

Claims 63 and 81 recite the limitation “ *such at least one user* “. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamlin et al. (US Patent 6,477,504, hereinafter Hamlin).

As to claim 35, Hamlin discloses an Internet website client-server computer system (Fig. 2A), for use to determine by e-mail survey a level of subject approval for each one of a population of survey participants by capturing each such participant's opinions about the degree of relevance of each of a respective set of natural language terms to each of a respective set of subjects (col. 1, lines 57-64, col. 10, lines 16-20, abstract), comprising:

a) a client interface system arranged so that a survey taker may indicate at least i) a defined question for the survey, ii) a such set of subjects to be evaluated, iii) a such set of natural-language terms to be rated as to relevancy to each subject, iv) a participant audience, and v) a time-frame for response (col. 1, lines 43-36, col. 2, lines 54-64, Figs. 2, 3, col. 7, lines 51-61, col. 9, lines 36-49, col. 6, lines 56-58);

b) a server computer processor system connected with said client interface system (Figs. 1, 2A; and

c) a server computer software system (Fig. 2A, 254), operational with said server computer processor system, arranged to provide survey processing comprising i) compiling a survey file and survey document in accordance with survey taker input, ii) communicating such survey document to such participant audience, and iii) receiving and tabulating responses (Figs. 2B, 3, col. 7, lines 19-61, col. 9, lines 28-31, col. 10, lines 11-23).

As to claim 36, Hamlin discloses the system according to claim 35 further comprising displaying survey results at a publicized URL (post result on a site, col. 10, lines 27-29).

Claims 43-45, 48-49, 52, and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hill et al. (US Patent 6,029,192, hereinafter Hill).

As to claim 43, Hill discloses an Internet client-server system (Fig. 15 and associated texts) for assisting at least one group of users having at least one common goal to capture and search, in a single database, offered knowledge, relevant to such at least one common goal, of a plurality of such users for the benefit of at least one of such users (abstract, Fig. 11), comprising:

- a) individually capturing for such database at least one experience of at least some of such plurality (Fig. 3, 31 and associated texts);
- b) storing in such database such experience (Fig. 3, 33 and associated texts);
- c) user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored experience (Figs. 8, 8A and associated texts);
- d) performing such user-searching (Figs. 8A, 9 and associated texts); and
- e) presenting search results (Fig. 11 and associated texts).

As to claim 44, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising searchably capturing for such database at least one item of such knowledge selected from the group consisting essentially of a) user-advice b) opinions of experts c) people who can help d) miscellaneous such knowledge of users (posted message, user evaluation, FAQ, col. 3, lines 41-51, col. 5, lines 1-8, col. 9, lines 7-9).

As to claim 45, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising a substantially automatic website management system (Figs. 8-12, and associated texts).

As to claim 48, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (newsgroups related to particular areas, col. 3, lines 34-36).

As to claim 49, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 44 further comprising searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (newsgroups related to particular areas, col. 3, lines 34-36).

As to **claim 52**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 wherein such step of user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored knowledge, further comprises: a) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience associated with chosen such at least one natural language word; b) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the text of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word; c) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the category of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word; and d) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the title of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word (Figs. 8, 8A and associated texts, col. 8, lines 45-59).

As to **claim 56**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising: a) rating the relative overall value of each such at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users; b) collecting comments about each at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users; and c) associating, in such database, respective such ratings of relative overall value and respective such collected comments with respective such at least one item of such experience (col. 9, lines 44-56, Fig. 11 and associated texts)

As to **claim 57**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising automatically accumulating system operation data (col. 2, lines 61-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 46-47, 50-51, 53-55, and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Ng (US Patent 6,405,175).

As to **claim 46**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 45 but does not explicitly disclose automatically rewarding assisting users for website management assistance.

Ng discloses a rewards database contains account records for users including a reward count for each user. A reward module is coupled to the rewards database. It is activated when the searcher views information in the target record. The reward module increases a reward count for the rewarded user when the searcher views the information in the target record submitted by the rewarded user (col. 3, lines 28-34).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the Internet data processing art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of the cited references, to include reward system for the user that submitted information to attract user providing product reviews ad consumer comments and opinions add to the usefulness of the overall Internet (col. 2, lines 49-63, Ng.).

As to **claim 47**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 45 further comprising: a) providing a software management system to directly manage such database and such population of users essentially without outside management (col. 2, lines 61-65); and b) providing for variables in such software management system to be configurable without affecting such direct management operations (newsgroup tree, Figs. 8, 9); c) wherein such software management system comprises i) measuring management efforts of each of at least one management sub-community (col. 9, lines 22-24), ii) setting goals for each of such management community (Fig. 9 and associated texts), and iii) managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such management sub-community.

Although Hill substantially teaches the claimed invention, Hill is silent on iii) managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such management sub-community.

Ng discloses a rewards database contains account records for users including a reward count for each user. A reward module is coupled to the rewards database. It is activated when the searcher views information in the target record. The reward module increases a reward count for the rewarded user when the searcher views the information in the target record submitted by the rewarded user (col. 3, lines 28-34).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the Internet data processing art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of the cited references, to include reward system for the user that submitted information to attract user providing product reviews ad consumer comments and opinions add to the usefulness of the overall Internet (col. 2, lines 49-63, Ng.).

As to claims 50 and 51, Hill and Ng disclose the Internet client-server system, further comprising a) providing at least one capability for at least one user to complete on-line at least one multiple choice poll (Ng, col. 18, lines 50-51); and b) providing at least one reward for such at least one user to completing such at least one multiple choice poll (Ng, col. 7, lines 65-67) and wherein: a) such common goal is sales-oriented,; b) such group of users comprises sales personnel; and c) those receiving such benefit comprise sales personnel (Ng, col. 2, lines 38-43).

As to claim 53, recites similar limitations as discussed in claim 46 above and is therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to **claim 54**, Hill and Ng disclose the Internet client-server system according to claim 53, further comprising: a) automatically measuring and storing each experience contribution, including users' comments made by each such at least one user (Ng, Fig. 3, Fig. 4, 67 and associated texts); b) assigning points to be accumulated for each such experience contribution (Ng, Fig. 5 and associated texts); c) automatically accumulating assigned points for each such experience contribution by each such at least one user (Ng, col. 3, lines 35-40); d) automatically reporting such points accumulated for each such experience contribution (Ng, col. 1, lines 17-18); e) defining at least one criteria for awarding prizes based on such accumulated points (Ng, col. 9, lines 23-29); and f) automatically awarding prizes to such at least one user with accumulated points meeting such at least one criteria (Ng, col. 9, lines 23-29).

As to **claim 55**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 45 further comprising a) managing such database and such group of users essentially without customer website management (col. 2, lines 61-65); b) permitting at least one customer to configure a plurality of variables in such computer software for such managing of such database (newsgroup tree, Figs. 8, 9); c) automatically setting goals for each such user participating in at least one management community (Fig. 9 and associated texts); and d) automatically managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such at least one user of such at least one management community.

Although Hill substantially teaches the claimed invention, Hill is silent on d) automatically managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such at least one user of such at least one management community.

Art Unit: 2166

Ng discloses a rewards database contains account records for users including a reward count for each user. A reward module is coupled to the rewards database. It is activated when the searcher views information in the target record. The reward module increases a reward count for the rewarded user when the searcher views the information in the target record submitted by the rewarded user (col. 3, lines 28-34).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the Internet data processing art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of the cited references, to include reward system for the user that submitted information to attract user providing product reviews ad consumer comments and opinions add to the usefulness of the overall Internet (col. 2, lines 49-63, Ng.).

As to claim 58, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 57 wherein such system operation data comprises: a) data about compliance with such set of performance goals for each of at least one involved subset of such population of users (col. 3, lines 7-19); b) data about each type of such stored experience (col. 1, lines 52-57); c) data about such reward system; and d) data about interviews of each of such involved subset of such population of users (Fig. 4 and associated texts).

Although Hill substantially teaches the claimed invention, Hill is silent on c) data about such reward system.

Ng discloses a rewards database contains account records for users including a reward count for each user (Fig. 2, 44).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the Internet data processing art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of the cited references, to include reward system for

the user that submitted information to attract user providing product reviews and consumer comments and opinions add to the usefulness of the overall Internet (col. 2, lines 49-63, Ng.).

As to claim 59, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 58 further comprising permitting such at least one user to view successively more detailed levels of such automatically accumulated system operation data (Figs. 8, 9 and associated texts).

Claims 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Yong et al. (US Patent 5,749,079, hereinafter "Yong").

As to claim 60, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising: a) requesting installation of at least one independent database access module onto the personal computer of such at least one user; b) permitting selection, using such independent database access module, of at least one category of such knowledge for display by such at least one user (Fig. 9 and associated texts); c) automatically searching, using such at least one independent database access module, such database, without need of a browser, for at least one selected category of such knowledge from such database (Fig. 8a and associated texts); and d) displaying, using such at least one independent database access module, found knowledge from such at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such database to such at least one user (Fig. 11 and associated texts).

Although Hill substantially teaches the claimed invention, Hill is silent on a) requesting installation of at least one independent database access module onto the personal computer of such at least one user and c) automatically searching without need of a browser.

However, Yong discloses adding a module called a database connectivity driver (such as ODBC) specific to the DBMS to seamlessly link the end-user query facility to these applications to enhance their query capability while still allowing the linking of these applications to the DBMS of the users' choice using a database connectivity driver specific to that DBMS (col. 39, line 33 to col. 40, line 17).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Hill's disclosure to include database connectivity interface as taught by Yong for the purpose of dynamic accessing database (col. 40, lines 32-42, Yong). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Hill per the above so that the end-user query facility can be linked to the DBMS of the user's choice (col. 40, lines 6-10, Yong).

As to claim 61, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 60 further comprising: a) displaying continuously at least one selected type of such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (Figs. 2, 8A and associated texts); and b) scrolling a display of at least one selected type of such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (Figs. 9, 10 and associated texts).

As to **claim 62**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 61 further comprising: a) making specific requests for information from information stored in such database by such at least one user (Fig. 8A and associated texts).

Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,948,054).

As to **claim 63**, Hill discloses the Internet client-server system according to claim 43 further comprising: a) receiving at least one request for information from such at least one user (Fig. 8A, 820 and associated texts); b) storing such at least one request for information; c) notifying designated other such at least one user with particular expertise about such at least one request for information (col. 9, lines 29-32); d) storing such at least one request for information and at least one response by such at least one user with particular expertise as such at least one experience; and e) notifying such at least one user, requesting information, of such at least one experience containing such at least one request and such at least one response.

Although Hill substantially teaches the claimed invention, Hill is silent on b) storing such at least one request for information (Nielsen, Fig. 3 and associated texts), d) storing such at least one request for information and at least one response by such at least one user with particular expertise as such at least one experience (Nielsen, Fig. 10B, 1009, 1011 and associated texts); and e) notifying such at least one user, requesting information, of such at least one experience containing such at least one request and such at least one response (Nielsen, Fig. 11 and associated texts).

Nielsen discloses sending an information request to the server via the customer computer. The request includes a question that the customer wishes to have answered. In response, the server determines which one or ones of the consultants is qualified to provide the requested information. The server then solicits the requested information from one or more of the qualified consultants and provides an answer to the customer (abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Hill's disclosure to match customers with questions to qualified consultants as taught by Nielsen for the purpose of soliciting the requested information from one or more of the qualified consultants (abstract, Nielsen). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Hill per the above such that questions can be answered in a cost effective way through the web (col. 1, lines 36-39, Nielsen).

Claims 64-85 have the same subject matter as of claims above and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully and carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Related Prior Arts

The following list of prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Havens; Charnell T., US 5924072 A, "Knowledge management system and method".
- Halverson; Helena B., US 6301564 B1, "Dimensional dining restaurant management system".
- Gilmour; David L. et al., US 6421669 B1, "Method and apparatus for constructing and maintaining a user knowledge profile".
- Bossemeyer, Jr.; Robert Wesley et al., US 6510427 B1, "Customer feedback acquisition and processing system".
- Walker; Jay S. et al., US 6616458 B1, "Method and apparatus for administering a survey".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 21, 2007

Shew-Fen Lin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2166

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hosain Alam', is positioned above the printed name.

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER